



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/630,162

07/30/2003

Irena Hudis

13768.429

7646

47973

7590

07/01/2008

WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT

1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER

60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE

SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER

POPHAM, JEFFREY D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2137

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/01/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/630,162	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HUDIS ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> JEFFREY D. POPHAM	<b>Art Unit</b> 2137	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 April 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 24-32, 34 and 36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 24-32, 34 and 36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

***Remarks***

Claims 24-32, 34, and 36 are pending.

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 24-32 and 34 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Objections***

2. Claims 34 and 36 are objected to because of the following informalities:
  - Claim 34 refers to "the remaining non-overlapping main security zones" in the 5<sup>th</sup> line of the splitting limitation, which should apparently read "the remaining non-overlapping main security zone".
  - Claim 36 claims dependency on canceled claim 1. For purposes of prior art rejection, claim 36 has been construed as being dependent from claim 24.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 24, 25, 27-32, 34, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnett (U.S. Patent 6,772,157) in view of Schmuck (U.S. Patent 6,021,508).

Regarding Claim 24,

Barnett discloses in a computer system that includes items stored in at least one volume being divided into at least one security zone, each of the at least one security zone being defined as a grouping of items having common security rules, each item residing in a security zone from among the at least one security zone, each security zone having one or more principals with administrative rights, a method of delegating administrative rights to other principals for first items included in a main security zone included in the at least one security zone, comprising:

An act of identifying first items and other items residing in a main security zone within a volume comprising a plurality of security zones (Column 6, lines 13-52; and Column 8, lines 8-34);

An act of splitting the main security zone into a first security zone and a remaining main security zone, the one or more main principals retaining administrative rights for the first security zone and the remaining main security zone, the first security zone including the first items and the remaining main security zone including only the other items from the main security zone not included in the first items (Column 6, lines 13-52; and Column 8, lines 8-34), and

An act of specifying that one or more first principals also have administrative rights to the first security zone containing the first items (Column 6, lines 13-52; and Column 8, lines 8-34);

But may not explicitly disclose that the zones are non-overlapping.

Schmuck, however, discloses identifying first items for which common security rules are to be enforced and other items for which common security rules are to be maintained independent from the common security rules of the identified first items; a first non-overlapping security zone of items having common security rules and a remaining non-overlapping main security zone having common security rules that are not dependent upon the common security rules of the first non-overlapping security zone such that the first non-overlapping security zone and the remaining non-overlapping main security zone do not overlap with any of the plurality of other non-overlapping security zones included in the volume, and that the splitting is restricted in such a way as to prevent overlapping between security zones and such that none of the first items and other items from the main non-overlapping security zone are shared when the main non-overlapping security zone is split wherein the security zones thereby have a dynamic configurable granularity of items having common security rules (Column 27, line 10 to Column 28, line 59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the ACL system of Schmuck into the

delegated administration system of Barnett in order to provide an access control mechanism that allows the same physical storage to be shared and referenced by any item that has the same security rules, thereby reducing the memory used by such security rules and allowing faster and more efficient access control determinations.

Regarding Claim 25,

Barnett as modified by Schmuck discloses the method of claim 24, in addition, Barnett discloses that specifying the one or more first principals is performed by the one or more main principals (Column 6, lines 13-52).

Regarding Claim 27,

Barnett as modified by Schmuck discloses the method of claim 24, in addition, Barnett discloses the administrative rights being security rights (Column 6, lines 13-52; and Column 8, lines 8-34).

Regarding Claim 28,

Barnett as modified by Schmuck discloses the method of claim 24, in addition, Barnett discloses the administrative rights being auditing rights (Column 6, lines 13-52; and Column 8, lines 8-34).

Regarding Claim 29,

Barnett as modified by Schmuck discloses the method of claim 24, in addition, Barnett discloses specifying security rules for the first security zone after the act of splitting (Column 6, lines 13-52; and Column 8, lines

8-34); and Schmuck discloses that the zones are non-overlapping (Column 27, line 10 to Column 28, line 59).

Regarding Claim 30,

Barnett as modified by Schmuck discloses the method of claim 24, in addition, Barnett discloses specifying security rules for the first security zone by defaulting the security rules that were from the main security zone prior to the act of splitting (Column 5, line 35 to Column 6, line 65); and Schmuck discloses that the zones are non-overlapping (Column 27, line 10 to Column 28, line 59).

Regarding Claim 31,

Barnett as modified by Schmuck discloses the method of claim 24, in addition, Barnett discloses recombining the first security zone and the remaining main security zone (Column 6, lines 53-65; and Column 12, line 45 to Column 13, line 8); and Schmuck discloses that the zones are non-overlapping (Column 27, line 10 to Column 28, line 59).

Regarding Claim 32,

Barnett as modified by Schmuck discloses the method of claim 24, in addition, Barnett discloses a subsequent remaining main security zone, the subsequent remaining main security zone formed from splitting the remaining main security zone, wherein the administrative principals of the subsequent remaining main security zone are the administrative principals in the main security zone, comprising an act of recombining the first

security zone and the subsequent remaining main security zone (Column 6, lines 53-65; and Column 12, line 45 to Column 13, line 8); and Schmuck discloses that the zones are non-overlapping (Column 27, line 10 to Column 28, line 59).

Regarding Claim 36,

Barnett as modified by Schmuck discloses the method of claim 24, in addition, Schmuck discloses that the security rules comprise an access control list defining the rights a principal has to the items in the security zone associated with the security rules (Column 27, line 10 to Column 28, line 59).

Regarding Claim 34,

Claim 34 is a computer program product claim that corresponds to method claim 36 and is rejected for the same reasons.

4. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnett in view of Schmuck, further in view of Anglin (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0199521).

Barnett as modified by Schmuck discloses the method of claim 24, in addition, associating an identical reference with the first items, referring to the zone's security rules (Column 27, line 10 to Column 29, line 59); but does not



explicitly disclose labeling the items with a zone enumeration corresponding to the first zone.

Anglin, however discloses labeling the first items with a security zone enumeration corresponding to the first non-overlapping security zone (Paragraphs 19, 24, and 25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the group management system of Anglin into the delegated administration system of Barnett as modified by Schmuck in order to explicitly associate items with their appropriate zone, as well as to associate a zone entry with all of the items that belong to that zone, thereby increasing ease of viewing, management, and use of the system.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JEFFREY D. POPHAM whose telephone number is (571)272-7215. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571)272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jeffrey D Popham  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2137

/Jeffrey D Popham/

Application/Control Number: 10/630,162

Page 10

Art Unit: 2137

Examiner, Art Unit 2137

/Emmanuel L. Moise/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2137